



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,098	04/23/2004	Tomomichi Obara	1081.1201	7523
21171	7590	06/23/2009	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			VU, TUAN A	
SUITE 700				
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/830,098	OBARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUAN A. VU	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,7-9,11,13,17-19 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3,7-9, 11,13,17-19,22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 6/02/09.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 1, 8, 11, 18 have been amended, claims 4-6, 14-16, 21 canceled, and claim 22 added. Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13, 17-19, 22 are pending in the office action.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5, 12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,131,577 (hereinafter '577) in view of Drummond et al, USPN: 7,025,255.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following observations. Following are but a few examples as to how the certain claims from the instant invention and from the above copending application are conflicting with each other.

As per instant claim 1, '577 claim 5 also recites Web server and performing guide display, transaction operation including a display unit, a plurality of I/O units, a control unit

controlling the guide display of the screen content according to object embedded in said screen content from the Web server, wherein the control unit calls method and controls sequence of said plurality of I/O units for said method; wherein said control unit calls up a method for 'each processing controlling the synchronization of said plurality of I/O units according to the script ... synchronization of said plurality of I/O units'. '577 Claim 5 recites interpreting a applet tag of an embedded object, which might not be identical to instant claim 1 reciting of 'interpreting a script of said object embedded in said screen content ... calls up a method for each processing ... controlling synchronization' even though '577 does not explicitly recite: *said screen content comprising a screen creation program described by a page description language, a script of said object and a method program which is called up by said script and defined by each processing of said transaction operation, and for synchronously operating said I/O units ...wherein said browser calls up said method, said method issuing said I/O command to said plurality of I/O controllers for controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units designated by said method and receiving a reply from said plurality of I/O units.*

Using a browser to interpret a content via interpreting script tag that embeds method call that invoke objects to perform I/O operations via sending commands and receiving returned data is disclosed in Drummond (col. 10 line 15 to col. 11 line 12) where screen guide tag includes embedding of script objects and method calls thereof; i.e. whereby to invoke additional applets that effectuate communication control and synchronization. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that '577 claim 5 does contain an obvious language variation of instant claim 1 from above via '577 interpreting a tag of a applet interpreting a embedded object in said screen content, and would be motivated to apply a browser interpreting of script as taught in Drummond

to effectuate synchronization of I/O as mentioned in '577 from above for calling the methods of objects or applet embedded in script so that browser parsing a screen creation program described a HTML form enables interpretation of tags as taught in '577.

As per instant claim 11, this claim corresponds to instant claim 1, while '577 claim 12 corresponds to '577 claim 5; hence, '577 claim 12 would be an obvious variant of instant claim 11, based on the analysis as set forth above.

4. Claims 1, 11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3, 12 of copending Patent Application No. 11,103,450 (hereinafter '450) in view of Drummond et al, USPN: 7,025,255. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following observations.

As per instant claim 1, '450 claim 3 also recites Web server and performing guide display, transaction operation including a display unit, a plurality of I/O units, a control unit controlling the guide display of the screen content according to object embedded in said screen content from the Web server; wherein said control unit calls up a method for *controlling* said plurality of I/O units by the script embedded in said screen content, said unit comprising a browser which interprets said script in processing units of the operation for synchronously controlling said I/O units. '450 does not recite: *said screen content comprising a screen creation program described by a page description language, a script of said object and a method program which is called up by said script and defined by each processing of said transaction operation, and for synchronously operating said I/O units ...wherein said browser calls up said method, said method issuing said I/O command to said plurality of I/O controllers for*

controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units designated by said method and receiving a reply from said plurality of I/O units. However '450 claim 3 recital of "calls up a method of an applet for controlling said I/O unit ... by the script embedded in said screen content" 'synchronously suggests the 'synchronization' and calling a method of applet inside a tag content of page of instant claim 1. Based on Drummond' s teaching of browser interpreting tag content and invoking commands in conjunction with *applets* to convey data between I/O and user interface (see col. 10 lines 27 to col 11 line 12) one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that '450 does contain an obvious language variation of instant claim 1 in terms of '450 claim 3's processing a embedded object of script in screen content so as to provide said *controlling* so that I/O operate synchronously and would be motivated to use a browser and a creation program as taught in Drummond from above for calling the methods of objects or applet embedded in script in terms that the browser parses a screen creation program described a HTML form enables interpretation of tags as taught in '577.

As per instant claim 11, this claim corresponds to instant claim 1, while '450 claim 12 corresponds to '450 claim 3; hence '450 claim 12 would be an obvious variant of instant claim 11, based on the analysis as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, claims 1, 11 recites 'browser which receives said screen content comprising: a screen creation program described by a page description language, a script of said object ... wherein said browser ... interprets said script of said object embedded in said screen content'. With respect to 'said script of said object embedded in said screen content', the claim only introduces 'said script of said object'; and based on this it is found that there is no corresponding description in the Specifications that explicitly convey a script of an object on a screen content. According to the Disclosure, the content received into the browser amounts to containing software objects either as Javascript embedded in the HTML page(Fig. 4) or agent or applets downloaded from a WWW server (Specs, pg. 17 bottom) and one of which would be used to construct the screen, use DLL communication API whereby invokes method in name of the JVscript of content 122 (Specs, pg. 18; Fig. 6). The screen content and the agents are both downloaded (pg. 17 bottom) such that the agent is not integral to this screen content and that agents can be invoked when a tag is embedding 'method name' supported by a applet (see pg. 23; Fig. 9). It is noted that nowhere in the Specifications, are the agents/applets embedded within 'screen content' received into the browser (*said screen content comprising: a screen creation program described by a page description language, a script of said object and a method program which is called up by said script*), since specification of JavaScript inside a page actually defines a agent (middle pg. 23) or rather defines a method supported by that agent. Nowhere is there a 'page description language' as screen creation program which is distinct from

‘script of said object’, and nowhere is there clear depiction of a “script of an object”, when in fact, a script might embed constructs representative of the underlying object to be invoked; e.g. Javascript object; and object representation being embedded as variable/data/element within a script construct cannot be same as ‘script of the object’. Objects are either Javascript in a received HTML or agent applets being downloaded to invoke the method of the JVscript in the HTML page; i.e. no “script of said object” is disclosed as being included within the very screen content which also contains a program (page description language) to create a screen (screen creation program), when *agents* are disclosed as being downloaded and uses DLL and/or API communication to construct/update a screen or invokes other applets, each implementing a ATM processing(see pg. 18-19), invoke methods of Javascript constructs inside one HTML page. The inventor is deemed not having possession of a entity understood as ‘script of an object’ embedded in screen content nor does the inventor possess the dual existence of “description language” for a screen creation program and “script of said object’. The limitations recited as ‘script of said object’ and/or ‘script of said objects embedded in said screen content’ cannot be given weight because of the lack of proper description; and that language will be interpreted as though Javascript embedded elements inside a received HTML page at the browser are embedding constructs whose objects can be invoked, such that by parsing this page, which is analogized to the “construction program” language description or “guide display”, instantiation of needed API calls or realization of the ATM processing steps are made possible, via browser interpretation of script constructs.

Claims 3, 7-9, 13, 17-19 are likewise rejected for lack of proper description for they fail to remedy to the above deficiency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13, 17-19, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Drummond et al, USPN: 7,025,255 (hereinafter Drummond).

As per claim 1, Drummond discloses automatic transaction apparatus for communicating with a Web server (HTTP server – Fig. 5-6; server 134 – Fig 25) and performing guide display and a transaction operation according to an operation of a user (Fig. 25, 27-28), comprising:

a display unit for performing said guide display (e.g. screen 30 – Fig. 2-3, 23-24; Fig. 28-31 – Note: display with integrated event listener via browser/user interface – see touch screen 30, browser 76, interface 32, Fig. 2 -- reads on guide display where graphical event-based activities guide the user with underlying and coordinated of object/code invocations to operate on the related interface units – interfaces, card reader cash dispenser, printer, Fig. 2);

a plurality of I/O units for performing said transaction operation (see I/O 36, Fig. 2) and comprising at least a cash processing unit, a medium handling unit, a user input unit and a card processing unit (interfaces 36 – Fig. 2-3; card reader, cash dispenser, touch screen, browser script, device in. software, keyboard depository – Fig. 5-6; Fig. 28); and

a control unit for controlling the guide display of the screen (e.g. touch screen 30, browser 76, interface 32, Fig. 2; browser 76 -Fig. 23) of said display unit according to a screen

content (e.g. *HTML documents that are received* - col. 10 line 28 to col. 11 line 12) from said Web server (e.g. applets 86, Javascript 82, Java program 70, sw interface 66, Fig. 2; Fig. 29-30; Fig. 39 to Fig. 54), and controlling said plurality of I/O units according to objects embedded in said screen content (col. 10 line 28 to col. 11 line 12; java applets, Javascript - Fig. 3-24),

wherein said control unit comprises:

a plurality of I/O controllers, each I/O controller controlling a corresponding said I/O unit according to a type of I/O command (applets 86, Javascript 82, Java program 70, sw interface 66, Fig. 2; Fig. 29-30; Fig. 39 to Fig. 54; col. 10 line 28 to col. 11 line 12; col. 9 lines 25-58) and

a browser which receives said screen content comprising:

a screen creation program described by a page description language (HTML document – col. 12 line 52 to col. 13 line 39; col. 20, line 55 to col. 21 line 3; *produce a visible page* - col. 17 line 64 to col. 18 line 15);

a script of said object (e.g. Javascript 82, Fig. 3); and a method program which is called up by said script (Note: script command and underlying JV calls reads on method program defined in script; col. 24 line 27-62) and is defined by each processing of said transaction operation, and for synchronously operating said plurality of I/O units (col. 10 line 28 to col. 11 line 12 – Note: refer to USC 112 rejection and interpretation of the above; col. 24 line 27-62 - Note: controls from parsing script constructs to invoking underlying applets to effectuate I/O operations – e.g. card reading, instructs lower device to deliver card data or to print a receipt - reads on synchronizing of I/O devices - col. 9 lines 25-58; col. 13 line 52 to col. 14 line 42),

wherein said browser interprets said screen content from said Web server and performs said guide display, and interprets said script of said object embedded in said screen content and

calls up said method (col. 10 line 28 to col. 11 line 12; col. 24 line 27-62), said method issuing said I/O commands to said plurality of I/O controllers for controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units designated by said called method and receiving a reply from said plurality of I/O units (col. 10 line 28 to col. 11 line 12 – Note: method being invoked pertain to constructs inside javascript tag – JVscript commands - of HTML which serve as guide or creation program; that is, the method pertinent to more bean/applets - col. 48 lines 18-41 - responsible for control and communication between user and I/O units ; javascript, Java applet - col. 24 line 27-55; col 45 line 20 to col 46 line 4 – and controls from parsing script constructs to invoking underlying applets to effectuate I/O operations – e.g. card reading, instructs lower device to deliver card data or to print a receipt - reads on synchronizing of I/O devices - col. 9 lines 25-58; col. 13 line 52 to col. 14 line 42).

As per claim 3, Drummond discloses wherein said control unit transmits a request to said Web server according to a post request (*message ... to print a customer's receipt* - col. 24 line 27-62; col. 37 lines 3-18; *script ... backstage applet ... make requests .. available servers* - col. 38 lines 64 to col. 39, line 42; Fig. 5; col. 13, lines 40-51; col. 14, lines 3-10) by said called up method (*... embedded Java script... Java applet* - col. 24 line 27-62)

As per claim 7, Drummond discloses wherein said control unit specifies said plurality of I/O units for which synchronization is controlled by said method according to input parameters (e.g. *HTML document ... address data and/or other parameters* - col. 26, lines 27-41; . *embedded Java script instructions ... cause dispense of currency* - Fig. 11 and related text – Note: instructions prompting user to enter PIN or to get dispensed currency reads on specifying

which I/O unit under control by the underlying embedded Java Script calls) attached to said script.

As per claim 8, Drummond discloses wherein said browser creates said guide screen by a screen creation program described by a page description language (produce a visible page - col. 17 line 64 to col. 18 line 15 –Note: refer to USC 112 rejection and interpretation of *a screen creation program described by a page description language* as from above; col. 20, line 55 to col. 21 line 3; col. 13 lines 56-65) of said screen content, calls up said method program from the script of said object (e.g. *HTML document ... embedded Java script... Java applet* -- col. 13 lines 56-65), and controls the synchronization of said plurality of I/O units (Fig. 11; refer to claim 1).

As per claim 9, Drummond discloses wherein said browser creates said guide screen by a screen creation program described by the page description language of said screen content (e.g. col. 20, line 55 to col. 21 line 3; *produce a visible page* - col. 17 line 64 to col. 18 line 15), calls up a method program of an applet from said applet specification (e.g. col. 24 line 27-62; *HTML document ... embedded Java script... Java applet* -- col. 13 lines 56-65; col. 27, lines 45-48) and method specification of the script of said object, and controls the synchronization of said plurality of I/O units (e.g. refer to claim 1: col. 13, line 65 to col. 14 line 2; col. 13 lines 56-65; refer to claim 1; Fig. 11; Fig. 31 and related text).

As per claim 11, Drummond discloses an automatic transaction system comprising: a Web server; and an automatic transaction apparatus which is connected to said web Server via a network for communicating with said Web server and performing guide display and a transaction operation according to an operation of a user,

wherein said automatic transaction apparatus comprises:

a display unit for performing said guide display;

a plurality of I/O units for performing said transaction operation and comprising at least a cash processing unit, a medium handling unit, a user input unit and a card processing unit; and

a control unit for controlling the guide display of the screen of said display unit according to a screen content from said Web server, and

controlling said plurality of I/O units according to objects embedded in said screen content,

wherein said control unit comprises:

a plurality of I/O controllers, each I/O controller controlling a corresponding said I/O unit according to a type of I/O command; and

a browser which receives said screen content comprising:

a screen creation program described by a page description language;

a script of said object; and

a method program which is called up by said script and is defined by each processing of said transaction operation, and for synchronously operating said plurality of I/O units,

wherein said browser interprets said screen content from said Web server and performs said guide display, and interprets said script of said object embedded in said screen content and calls up said method, said method issuing said I/O commands to said plurality of I/O controllers for controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units designated by said called method and receiving a reply from said plurality of I/O units.

all of which having been addressed in claim 1

As per claims 13, 17-19, these claims correspond to claims 3, 7-9, respectively, hence will

As per claim 22, Drummond discloses a method, comprising:

running a single script using a processor (col. 10 line 28 to col. 11 line 12; col. 24 line 27-62) which calls a process (e.g. applet 86 Java program 70 device Sw interface 66 – Fig. 2) stored on a computer readable storage, the process executed once for an ATM transaction comprising: synchronizing a plurality of input/output units (col. 24 line 27-62 Note: controls from parsing script constructs to invoking underlying applets to effectuate I/O operations – e.g. card reading, instructs lower device to deliver card data - reads on synchronizing of I/O devices - col. 9 lines 25-58; col. 13 line 52 to col. 14 line 42);

issuing input/output commands to a plurality of input/output controllers controlling the input/output units (col. 17 line 64 to col. 18 line 15; col. 13 line 56 to col. 14, line 13); and receiving replies from the plurality of input/output units (col. 13 line 56 to col. 14, line 13; col. 24 line 27-62); and

displaying standardized screen content (produce a visible page - col. 17 line 64 to col. 18 line 15; col. 20, line 55 to col. 21 line 3; col. 13 lines 56-65) using the processor on a display for the ATM transaction (Fig. 1-3; Fig. 27).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 6/02/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Following are the Examiner's observation in regard thereto.

USC 102 Rejection:

(A) Applicants have submitted that as recited, method program “is defined by each processing of said transaction operation” and that said “method is issuing commands to said plurality of I/O controllers for controlling a synchronization of I/O units by said called method and receiving a reply” and that in Drummond, device (printer object or dispenser object) has its own method that must be called, not a method defined by a program as from the claim (Appl. Rmrks pg. 7 top half). Device layers require system calls while methods from inside applets or Java code can be invoked as shown in Drummond’s application layer (Fig 2) from interpreting tag content inside message communicated, such as invoking JVscript constructs inside the received HTTP document at the browser interpreter level; and all this has been cited using Drummond for each instance where a JV script and a underlying applet is invoked via specific example of I/O operations. The method for objects (Fig. 39) related to ATM or I/O operations have been illustrated in Fig. 40-53; and these (e.g. ATM) objects are implemented with Java, bean or applets (col. 50 lines 16-21; col. 48 lines 18-41) hence method for OO classes (bean or applets) are disclosed for each said I/O operations whose invocations or calling is indirectly defined in embedded tag such as JVscript constructs that are identified from the browser’s parsing at the upper layer (see col. 24 line 27-55). The teachings by Drummond are deemed matching the claim limitations.

(B) Applicants have submitted that ‘sync object’ in Drummond is silent with regard to ‘method program … defined by each processing of said transaction operation’ as Drummond does not discuss ‘method program … controlling a synchronization’ as now recited (Appl. Rmrks pg. 17 bottom). This argument is referred back to section A. Applets or Java methods are invoked from the definition identified inside the HTML document being parsed at the upper

application layer; and the corresponding ATM operations for which applets are invoked are shown in Fig. 39-54, and how synchronization has been interpreted has been explained in the Office action. The argument is not persuasive.

(C) Along with claim 11 which recites the same limitations as claim 1, the amended claims are in all rejected as this is set forth in the Office Action.

Interview Summary

10. The representative, John Bednarz, was contacted on 6/19/09 in order to be proposed some additional modification to the browser functional portion within the subject matter of independent claims 1, 11; and to this end, emphasis was indicated by the Examiner, that some teaching pertinent with script, objects (e.g. some teaching regarding utilization or implementing of applets/agent can help imparting some patentable weight) and APIs invocations derived from the Disclosure would have to be re-evaluated and properly represented in a more coherent manner. What was being conveyed was that, without a reasonable establishing how the claimed elements interrelate, what the process being achieved is all about, how the structural relationship amounts to; and at the same time whether such relationship is supported by the Disclosure, it would be unlikely for one to be able identify allowable subject matter. No agreement was reached because of some time constraint.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on (571)272-3759.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tuan A Vu/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193

June 21, 2009